



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,444	07/16/2003	Noriyuki Fukui	240303US2	6955

22850 7590 05/04/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SANTIAGO CORDERO, MARIVELISSE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2687

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/619,444

Applicant(s)

FUKUI, NORIYUKI

Examiner

Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero

Art Unit

2687

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/16/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on July 16, 2003 has been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the **non-acknowledgment information already sent at a predetermined number of consecutive times** (See claim 3) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

Art Unit: 2687

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. **It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.**

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "fonctionnality" (page 1, line 7) should be replaced with --functionality--; the term "channelisation" (page 1, line 12) should be replaced with --channeling--. Appropriate correction is required.

7. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (page 1, line 28; page 3, line 5). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 1-5 are objected to because of the following informalities: the term “characterised” (Claim 1, line 7; Claims 2-5, line 1) should be replaced with --characterized--. Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 5 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend on any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ahmed et al. (hereinafter “Ahmed”; Patent No.: 6,631,127).

Ahmed discloses a method for reporting the quality of a transmission channel between a transmitter and a receiver, said transmitter transmitting frames of data over said transmission channel (col. 3, lines 59) and said receiver sending back to said transmitter a non-acknowledgement information (NACK) when a received frame of data is detected as erroneous

Art Unit: 2687

(col. 3, lines 30-34 and 59-63), said receiver sending to said transmitter at scheduled reporting times an information (CQ1) representative of the quality of the transmission channel at said reporting times (col. 3, lines 59-65; the SNR, i.e., signal-to-noise ratio, being the quality of the transmission channel and the scheduled reporting times being every two milliseconds), characterized in that, when said receiver sends a non-acknowledgement information back to said transmitter, it additionally sends an information representative of the quality of the transmission channel at the time a non-acknowledgement information is sent (col. 3, lines 59-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

14. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed in view of Miyoshi et al. (hereinafter "Miyoshi"; Pub. No.: US 2003/00226929).

Ahmed discloses the method according to claim 1 (see above). Ahmed fails to disclose it characterized in that, when a receiver sends non-acknowledgement information back to said

transmitter, said receiver only sends said information representative of the quality of the transmission channel if it has already sent a non-acknowledgement information at a predetermined number of consecutive times.

However, Miyoshi, in a method wherein a transmitter transmits frames of data over a transmission channel and a receiver sends back to said transmitter a non-acknowledgement information (NACK) when a received frame of data is detected as erroneous (page 2, paragraph [0031]), discloses when a receiver sends non-acknowledgement information back to said transmitter, said receiver only sends said information representative of the quality of the transmission channel if it has already sent a non-acknowledgement information at a predetermined number of consecutive times (page 2, paragraph [0032]; page 8, paragraph [0119]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to only send the information representative of the quality of the transmission channel of Ahmed if it has already sent a non-acknowledgment information at predetermined number of consecutive times as suggested by Miyoshi.

One of ordinary skill in this art would have been motivated to only send the information representative of the quality of the transmission channel if it has already sent non-acknowledgment information at predetermined number of consecutive times to thereby making it possible to select a communication mode that enables communication to be performed most efficiently with the current actual channel quality (Miyoshi: page 5, paragraph [0070]) and because reception quality determination can be performed quickly and easily (Miyoshi: page 5, paragraph [0071]).

Art Unit: 2687

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dick et al. (Pub. No.: 2004/0005903) and Hwang et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0168945) disclose sending back an acknowledgement/non-acknowledgment to a transmitter based on quality comparison to a threshold; Aizawa et al. (Pub. No.: US 202/0168946) discloses sending back an acknowledgement/non-acknowledgment signal and quality information to a transmitter.

Allowable Subject Matter

16. Claims 2 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the references of record alone or in combination disclose or suggest: only send said information representative of the quality of the transmission channel if the quality of the transmission channel has deteriorated by at least a predetermined amount (δ) over the last reported quality of the transmission channel (claim 2); and if by the time an acknowledgment is sent, the quality of the transmission channel has improved by at least a predetermined amount (Δ) over the last reported quality of the transmission channel, it additionally sends an information representative of quality of the information channel at the time the acknowledgment information is sent (claim 4).

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marivelisse Santiago-Cordero whose telephone number is (571) 272-7839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2687

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



W. R. YOUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER